

REMARKS

Administrative Overview

Claims 1-40 were considered in the Office Action dated May 12, 2004. The Office Action rejects claims 1-7, 12-27, and 31-40.

The Office Action states on page 6 that claims 8-11 and 28-31 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Applicant hereby cancels claims 2, 7, 22, and 27, without prejudice, and Applicant amends claims 1 and 21. Support for the amendments appear in the specification as originally filed, for example, at paragraph [0008] on page 2, at paragraph [0014] on page 4, and in original claims 7-9 and 27-29. No new matter is added thereby. Applicant submits that these amendments place the application in condition for allowance.

Applicant also amends claims 8, 9, 28, and 29 to update claim dependencies. No new matter is added thereby.

Following entry of this Amendment, claims 1, 3-6, 8-21, 23-26, and 28-40 will be pending in this application.

Claims 1 and 21 Are Amended to Place Them in Condition for Allowance

According to page 6 of the Office action “[t]he prior art does not teach the geometry shape [being] displaced away from the virtual tool [or] toward the virtual tool.”

Applicant amends independent claim 1 to include the limitation, “applying the resulting modification of the geometrical shape by manipulation of a virtual tool, wherein the geometrical shape is displaced with respect to the virtual tool.” The amendment is supported in the specification as originally filed, for example, at paragraph [0008] on page 2, as well as in original claims 7-9.

Similarly, applicant amends claim 21 to include the limitation, “a modification module that applies the resulting modification of the geometrical shape by manipulation of a virtual tool, wherein the geometrical shape is displaced with respect to the virtual tool.” The amendment is supported in the specification as originally filed, for example, at paragraph [0014] on page 4, as well as in original claims 27-29.

Claims 1 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a), as being anticipated by Milliron (U.S. Patent No. 6,608,631). Because Milliron does not disclose each and every limitation of either claim 1 or claim 21, claims 1 and 21 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) over Milliron. Applicants request that the rejection of claims 1 and 21 be reconsidered and withdrawn, and that claims 1 and 21 be allowed.

Claims 3-6, 13-20, 23-26, 30, 31, and 33-40 Are Patentable Over Milliron

Claims 3-6, 13-20, 23-26, 30, 31, and 33-40 depend directly or indirectly from either claim 1 or claim 21, and each contains all the limitations of claim 1 or 21. Therefore, claims 3-6, 13-20, 23-26, 30, 31, and 33-40 are also patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) over Milliron. Applicants request that the rejection of these claims be reconsidered and withdrawn, and that these claims be allowed.

Claims 12 and 32 Are Patentable Over Milliron in view of Stewart et al.

Claims 12 and 32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Milliron in view of Stewart et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,973,678). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 12 depends from claim 1, and claim 32 depends from claim 21. In order to render a claim obvious, one or more cited references must teach or suggest each and every limitation of the claim. Neither Milliron nor Stewart teach or suggest each and every limitation of either claim 1 or claim 21. Thus, dependent claims 12 and 32 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Milliron in view of Stewart et al. Applicants request that the rejection of these claims be reconsidered and withdrawn, and that these claims be allowed.

CONCLUSION

Applicant requests that the Examiner reconsider the Application and claims in light of the foregoing amendments. Applicant respectfully submits that in view of the amendments and remarks herein, all of claims 1, 3-6, 8-21, 23-26, and 28-40 are in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner believes that it would be useful to discuss any aspect of the application by telephone, the undersigned representative cordially invites the Examiner to call at the telephone number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



William R. Haulbrook, Ph.D.
Attorney for Applicants
Testa, Hurwitz & Thibeault, LLP
125 High Street
Boston, MA 02110

Date: August 12, 2004
Reg. No. 53,002

Telephone: (617) 310-8427
Facsimile: (617) 248-7100